



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MAY 19, 2003

No. 74

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ADERHOLT).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

May 19, 2003.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROBERT B. ADERHOLT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) for 5 minutes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested.

S. 459. An act to ensure that a public safety officer who suffers a fatal heart attack or stroke while on duty shall be presumed to have died in the line of duty for purposes of public officer survivor benefits.

S. 535. An act to provide Capitol-flown flags to the families of law enforcement officers and firefighters killed in the line of duty.

THE FAMILY TIME FLEXIBILITY ACT

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, one of the biggest challenges working men and women face today is balancing the needs of family with demands of work schedules. This conflict may weigh most heavily on women; but all workers, regardless of gender, experience conflict between work and family, watching their child's soccer game or going through the stack of papers on their desk.

To address this problem, I introduced the Family Time Flexibility Act, legislation that would provide hourly workers the option of taking paid time and a half off in lieu of time and a half pay for hours worked overtime. This concept is a very simple one. If workers have to work overtime, they should be allowed to choose how they are compensated, with more money or paid time off.

The editorial page of the Detroit News recently weighed in on this important topic by saying: "Having more flexible hours is among the top wishes of working parents in this country. But an archaic Federal law has become a big impediment to parents and other workers in getting their wish."

Mr. Speaker, this "archaic" law, the 1938 Fair Labor Standards Act, has been frozen for more than 60 years, locked in a time when women worked in the home, most families had only one wage earner, and nobody went to their kids' soccer games. Times have changed. Families have changed, and the workforce has changed. Yet the law has not changed. We know that workers in Federal, State, and local governments are permitted to choose time and a half off for working overtime hours and thus enjoy a great deal more flexibility than their private sector counterparts. Federal workers use it and like it. Police officers use it and like it. Park district workers use it and like it. In fact, one employee back in

my district in suburban Chicago told me that he banks plenty of overtime hours plowing the snow during the long winter months and that allows him to take a longer vacation or spend more time with his family later during the few months when the weather is actually nice in Chicago.

For some employees, time can be more valuable than money, particularly if they have been putting in a lot of overtime hours. Their spouses begin to wonder if they are married to their job. Their children begin to forget what they look like. Their paychecks are growing, but they really would rather have just a little more time and a little more money. Most workers just want the freedom to make that choice for themselves, and many employers would like to offer them that choice. That is what this bill does. It gives employees choice and flexibility, and it gives employers another option to offer those employees who want it.

That is what the bill does. Here is what the bill does not do: this bill in no way affects the sanctity, the primacy, or the inviolability of the 40-hour work week. Let me repeat. The 40-hour work week is the law. Under this bill, an employee would earn overtime in the very same way that he or she currently does, by working more than 40 hours in a 7-day period. The bill does not alter the way that overtime is calculated. What this bill does not do is require employees to take compensatory time or require employers to offer it. In fact, this bill contains numerous safeguards to protect the employee and to ensure that the choice and selection of compensatory time is truly voluntary on the part of the employee.

This bill does not give employers all the choices. Where necessary, there are effective sanctions under the bill and the Fair Labor Standards Act for employers who violate the employee protections and other provisions of this

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4207

legislation. For example, the bill expressly prohibits an employer from directly or indirectly intimidating; threatening; coercing, or attempting to coerce, any employee for the purposes of interfering with an employee's right to take or not to take comp time or to use accrued comp time. The bill creates a new remedy under the Fair Labor Standards Act for employers who violate the anticoercion language just described.

Let me note that this bill is not mandatory for anyone. The employer need not opt to offer family time, and the employee need not opt to take family time. It is all about choices. The employer chooses whether to offer the option, and the employee chooses whether to use the option; and if an employee changes his or her mind, he or she can at any time choose to cash out, and the employer must make the payout within 30 days.

H.R. 1119 is a comprehensive, balanced bill that gives more choices for employees and more opportunities for employers to keep their employees happy. This bill is not a mandate on employers or employees. It simply gives both parties the opportunity to agree to these arrangements, an opportunity which is now denied to them by law.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the Family Time Flexibility Act.

CALLING FOR THE RESIGNATION OF PAUL WOLFOWITZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was appalled 2 weeks ago to read that Deputy Secretary Paul Wolfowitz, one of the key policymakers in this administration, had publicly criticized, for Turkish consumption, the Turkish military for abiding by democracy. In an interview, which I will put into the RECORD, with CNN Turk, Deputy Secretary Wolfowitz repeatedly criticized the Turkish military because it had allowed democracy to function in Turkey. And he ought to resign. We have much too much at stake in our effort to bring stable democracy to the world in general, and particularly the Middle East, to allow a man to stay in that high office who has allowed himself to say that the military did too little, was not strong enough in pressing a democratically elected government. Indeed, it is especially disturbing to have that said with regard to the government of Turkey.

Trying to encourage Islamist movements that are genuinely democratic is one of our highest goals. The clash that some have argued exists between Islamic fundamentalism and democracy is a terrible threat to the world. We have in Turkey now a government that

has Islamist groups, the political majority, and is also committed to democracy. And that parliament made a decision, not the government but the parliament, that we did not like. It failed to get a sufficient majority to join us in the war effort.

And here is what Paul Wolfowitz has to say: "... many of the institutions in Turkey that we think of as the traditional strong support is the alliance were not as forceful in leading in that direction."

Question: "Which traditional alliance are you talking about?"

"... I think particularly the military." This is Mr. Wolfowitz: "I think for whatever reason they did not play the strong leadership role on that issue that we would have expected." And the questioners were somewhat puzzled. Here is a high American official. We have said we are going to war in Iraq in part to bring about democracy, and he is criticizing a military in Turkey because it had not strongly tried to influence the elected officials? So they say what kind of a role the military might have because after all the military is not in parliament. And another interviewer says: "And they have been criticized by getting involved in politics."

Mr. Wolfowitz seems to realize he said something that he should not have, but he cannot help himself. His contempt for the democratic process, if it comes out with results he does not like, was too strong. His partisanship on this issue was too strong. So here is what Mr. Wolfowitz says: "I'm not suggesting you get involved in politics at all. I mean, I think, all I'm saying is that when you had an issue of Turkey's national interest ... I think it's perfectly appropriate, especially in your system," my emphasis, "for the military to say it was in Turkey's interest to support the United States in that effort."

The interviewer says: "Didn't they say that?"

Mr. Wolfowitz's response: "I don't know. My impression is they didn't say it with the kind of strength that would have made a difference."

In other words, they did not muscle the government. They did not use armed force, the threat of armed force, as unfortunately the Turkish military has in the past, to force the Turkish Parliament to take an action which we wanted them to take.

Mr. Wolfowitz is the Deputy Secretary of Defense. As David Greenway pointed out in the Boston Globe last week, "The Turks are perfectly aware of the Pentagon's creeping takeover of U.S. foreign policy. There will be some who consider Wolfowitz's remarks as encouragement to boot out Erdogan," the Turkish prime minister.

Let me stress again how important it is for the experiment we are seeing in Turkey to succeed, a democratic Islamist government, and they had a tough issue that we dropped in their laps; and the parliament voted and the government tried and could not get a

majority. And the Deputy Secretary of Defense says the military was not strong enough, the military did not intervene forcefully enough the way that they traditionally have? This is appalling to have such a high-ranking American official say this, and we have already got problems in post-war Iraq.

The administration's policy is a shambles there. Mr. Wolfowitz can take some of the responsibility for that. He is one of those who scoffed when Army Chief of Staff Shinseki said we are going to need several hundred thousand troops, and now of course we are being told 150,000 troops is not enough. But we have this terrible problem in Iraq clearly now since there have not been found the kinds of weapons that the administration said there would be, certainly not in the quantity they predicted.

The justification for Iraq is the impact it will have on governments in Iraq and in the rest of the Middle East. How does it help to have our Deputy Secretary of Defense, one of the shapers of that policy, now say, by the way, when we say democracy, we mean a democracy where the military intervenes strongly, not just gives its viewpoint but intervenes strongly to make sure things come out? Things in Iraq and our credibility are in enough trouble without Paul Wolfowitz compounding it, and he ought to resign.

[From the Boston Globe, May 16, 2003]

DEMOCRACY, NEOCON STYLE

(By H.D.S. Greenway)

Neoconservatives, who have risen to great power and influence within the Bush administration, have told us of their sweeping design to transform the Middle East into a model of democracy. Skeptics have demurred, but the neocons have countered that the doubters lack vision. There have been recent events, however, that bring into question the sincerity of these grand visionaries.

Take, for example, the recent remarks of Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, perhaps the most influential of the right-wing conservatives in government. Although the State Department got most of the blame for the diplomatic debacle over Turkey's failure to allow US troops to transit en route to Iraq, it was Wolfowitz who conducted much of the negotiations.

As it was, Turkey's new, democratically elected Parliament said no, much to Washington's chagrin and to the embarrassment of the Turkish government, which had urged a "yes" vote. Turkey was not the first government in a democratic state to be rebuffed by legislators. It happens in the United States all the time.

But last week, in an interview with CNN, Wolfowitz lashed out at the Turkish military for the failure to fall into line. "I think for whatever reason, they did not play the strong leadership role that we would have expected," he said.

Consider the ramifications of this statement in the Turkish context. Democracy in Turkey is alive but fragile. Open elections began only in the 1950s. Traditionally the Turkish military has seen itself as the guardian of the secular state that Kemal Ataturk put into place following the end of the Ottoman Empire after World War I.

The Turkish generals have made it a habit to step in from time to time to dismiss governments they do not like, returning rule to